UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/727,199	12/02/2003	John Barrus	20412-08188	5157

758 7590 12/26/2007

FENWICK & WEST LLP
SILICON VALLEY CENTER
801 CALIFORNIA STREET
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041

EXAMINER	
SHERMAN, STEPHEN G	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2629	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/26/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/727,199	BARRUS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Stephen G. Sherman	2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 November 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,4-8,10-12,15-17,19,22,25,27,29,30,34-40,42-44 and 46-49* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,4-8,10-12,15-17,19,22,25,27,29,30,34-40,42-44 and 46-49* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *02 December 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed 29 November 2007. Claims 1,4-8,10-12,15-17,19,22,25,27,29,30,34-40,42-44 and 46-49 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 29 November 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues the rejection of the independent claims 1, 27, 29, 30, 38, 46 and 48 beginning on page 19 of the response. On page 20 of the response, the applicant argues specifically that Nakagawa merely discloses an interactive display whiteboard, in which windows displayed on the whiteboard may be moved such that they are displayed in a different position on the whiteboard. The applicant then states that Nakagawa does not disclose or suggest displaying a portion of a display image corresponding to a portion of the source image. The examiner agrees with this characterization of Nakagawa, however, the examiner did not use Nakagawa to teach " displaying a portion of a display image corresponding to a portion of the source image" as suggested by the applicant. The applicant next argues the use of Spletzer by stating that Spletzer does not teach of providing an changes to a source image via user input and thus does not show displaying portions of a display image corresponding to windows from the source image as articulated in the claims. The examiner agrees with

this assessment of Spletzer, however, the examiner never stated that Spletzer taught the features asserted. The examiner merely used Spletzer to teach of using a window projector and a workspace projector such that an object of interest, such as a window, can be projected by a first projector and the rest of the image can be projected by a second projector. Then in combination with Nakagawa, Spletzer's teachings can be applied the window, which is of interest to the user, where the window can be projected by the first projector and the rest of the image projected by the second. The applicant then continues on the argue the use of the Lechner reference by stating that Lechner does not describe any changes to a source image via user input and does not show displaying portions of a display image corresponding to windows from the source image as articulated in the claims. The examiner agrees that Lechner does not describe any changes to a source image via user input. Lechner was not used to teach this feature. Lechner was used to teach of a multi-projector display system in with a second projector for displaying a second portion of an image comprising a blank area corresponding to a display location of a first portion of the image displayed by a first projector, wherein no light is projected in the blank area by the second projector. Thus Lechner not teaching the other aspects of the claim is irrelevant to the examiner's rejection. The examiner would like to remind the applicant that one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Further, the applicant lastly states on page 22 that the applicant can find nowhere in Nakagawa, Spletzer, Lechner or Dugdale any disclosure or suggestion of a source image for receiving user input to affect changes to a display image. Since the applicant cannot find this feature taught in the references the examiner will help point out the teaching. As explained in the rejection below, Nakagawa shows in Figures 9A and 9B that there is a window 61 which is moved by a user input device I. Paragraph [0072] explains that the image display control unit 43 initiates the window shift control processing program shown in Figure 10. Since the display is created by the projector from a single source image, user input is received to affect changes to a display image. Thus Nakagawa teaches the limitation the applicant apparently could not find in the reference, and thus the claims are taught by the applied references.

The applicant next argues the rejection of claims 4 and 30. The applicant argues that Nakagawa uses a single projector, while Spletzer does not disclose "change in which window of an image is active, i.e., which window is selected by the user, and thus does not disclose changes to which projector displays a portion of an image, and also argues that Lechner does not disclose the ability to "change an active window, such that which window is selected via user input changes from one window to another, nor correlating change in projector for the window." The examiner respectfully disagrees. The applicant is not considering the combination of references. Nakagawa already discloses multiple windows [See Figure 9A, windows 61 and 61]. When using a computer, it is inherent that when there are two windows, that when a user clicks on one it is active and when the user clicks to the other, the second window becomes active

while the first window becomes inactive. This is a common concept that everyone who has ever used a computer knows about. Spletzer specifically discloses in column 2, lines 11-29, that the subset shown in higher resolution can be a portion of the image deserving specific attention. When used in the concept of having multiple window, when one window is active it is something that deserves more specific attention since the user is typically looking at the window that is active. Thus in combination, the active window will be the portion of the display projected in higher resolution. The examiner would like to once again remind the applicant that one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In response to the argument against the rejection of claims 22, 25 and 27 by individually attacking the references, while failing to explicitly point out the problems with previously rejected claim 24 which recited this feature. Instead the applicant states that Fisher does not teach "multiple projectors collectively displaying a second portion of an image comprising a blank area such that no seam is visible in the blank area, however, the reference was only used to teach that there is no seam. The examiner would like to once again remind the applicant that one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. Claims 1,4-13, 15-17, 19-20, 22, 27, 29-30, 33-40 and 42-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakagawa (US 2004/0095314) in view of Spletzer et al. (US 6,919,909) and further in view of Lechner et al. (US 5,487,665).

Regarding claim 1, Nakagawa discloses a projector display system for displaying on a screen a display image corresponding to a source image including at least one window (Figures 4 and 9A-B and paragraph [0048] explains that the projector projects a source image onto a display screen of a whiteboard.), comprising:

a projector for displaying the display image (Figure 4 shows projector 3.);

an input device, for receiving user input changing the source image (Figure 4 shows user input device 1, which changes the source image by dragging a window, etc. [see Figures 9A and 9B.]); and

a control mechanism, coupled to the projector and input device, for, responsive to the input device receiving a user command to drag the movable window from a first location to a second location in the source image, controlling the projector to affect a change on the screen of the display image (Figure 4 shows the image display control unit 43 and Figures 9A-B show the movement of a window with respect to a user command to drag the window, as explained in Figure 10 and paragraphs [0070]-[0076].).

Nakagawa fails to teach of a multi-projector display system comprising a window projector, for displaying, at a display location, a portion of the image corresponding to a movable window and a workspace projector, for displaying the remainder of the image.

Spletzer et al. disclose of a multi-projector display system comprising:

a window projector, for displaying, at a display location, a portion of the image corresponding to a movable object (Figure 1 shows item 12 which displays a subset of the total image as explained in column 2, lines 11-19. Column 2, lines 22-29 explain that the subset of data, i.e. the data projected by the second projector, can change with time, such that the subset would move with the movement of the pointing device or an on screen object. The examiner understands that the onscreen object could be a window.); and

a workspace projector, for displaying a second portion of the image (Figure 1 shows item 11 which displays an entire image on a display surface as explained in column 2, lines 11-19.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art at the time the invention was made to use the idea of having separate projectors as taught by Spletzer et al. with the display window projector system taught by Nakagawa in order to allow for the part of the display screen that the user is focusing on to be displayed in a higher resolution than the rest of the screen without incurring the cost associated with displaying the entire image at the higher resolution.

Nakagawa and Spletzer et al. fail to disclose that the workspace projector, for displaying the second portion of the image that comprises a blank area corresponding to the display location of the movable window, wherein no light is projected in the black area by the workspace projector.

Lechner et al. disclose of a multi-projector display system in with a second projector for displaying a second portion of an image comprising a blank area corresponding to a display location of a first portion of the image displayed by a first projector, wherein no light is projected in the blank area by the second projector (Column 5, lines 1-17 and column 7, lines 18-40).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the multi-projector display system taught by the combination of Nakagawa and Spletzer et al. such that the window projector is a detailed inset projector and the background projector leaves a void where the window

projector displays its image in order to allow for better image quality of the high resolution image.

Regarding claim 4, please refer to the rejection of claim 1, and furthermore given the combination of references, the examiner interprets that since the window projector taught by Spletzer et al. changes the subset based the portion requiring specific attention (see column 2, lines 11-29 and the rejection above.) that when used in combination with Nakagawa, the second projector will change focus from a first window on the screen to a second window on the screen, leaving the first window to be displayed by the workspace projector, when a user uses the input device to select the window.

Regarding claim 5, Nakagawa, Spletzer et al. and Lechner et al. disclose the display system of claim 1.

Spletzer et al. also disclose wherein:

the window projector displays the first portion of the image at a first level of resolution and the workspace projector displays the remainder of the image at a second level of resolution (Column 16, lines 11-18 explains that each projector in the example could be set to a resolution of 1024X728, meaning that the first and second level of resolutions are equal, see also column 1, lines 55-62).

Regarding claim 6, Nakagawa, Spletzer et al. and Lechner et al. disclose the display system of claim 5.

Spletzer et al. also disclose wherein the first level of resolution is greater than the second level of resolution (Column 1, lines 55-62.).

Regarding claim 7, Nakagawa, Spletzer et al. and Lechner et al. disclose the display system of claim 1.

Nakagawa, Spletzer et al. and Lechner et al. fail to explicitly teach wherein the window projector displays the first portion of the image in monochrome and the workspace projector displays the second portion of the image in color, however, since the applicant has disclosed this feature as a variation, the feature is not essential to the invention, and it would have been an obvious design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make one projector monochrome and the other projector color.

Regarding claim 7, Nakagawa, Spletzer et al. and Lechner disclose the display system of claim 1.

Lechner et al. also wherein the window projector displays the first portion of the image in monochrome (see col. 6, lines 2-5) and the workspace projector displays the second portion of the image in color (see col. 5, lines 9-13).

Regarding claim 8, Nakagawa, Spletzer et al. and Lechner disclose the display system of claim 7.

Lechner also discloses wherein the first portion of the image is displayed in high resolution and the second portion of the image is displayed in low resolution (Column 5, lines 63-64).

Regarding claim 10, Nakagawa, Spletzer et al. and Lechner et al. disclose the display system of claim 1.

Spletzer et al. also disclose wherein the window projector and the workspace projector are coupled to a common image source, and wherein the first portion of the display image displayed by the window projector and the second portion of the display image displayed by the workspace projector are derived from a single image (Column 1, lines 56-62 explain that the portions of the image displayed by the projectors are from a single image.).

Regarding claim 11, Nakagawa, Spletzer et al. and Lechner et al. disclose the display system of claim 1.

Spletzer et al. also disclose wherein the window projector is coupled to a first image source (Figure 1 shows image source 18.), and the workspace projector is coupled to a second image source (Figure 1 shows image source 19.).

Regarding claim 12, please refer to the rejection of claim 4, where the examiner explains that based on the combination of Nakagawa, Spletzer et al. and Lechner et al. when there are two windows, the window that is selected by the user, i.e. active, is the window in which the window projector will display the portion of the image.

Regarding claim 15, Nakagawa, Spletzer et al. and Lechner et al. disclose the display system of claim 1.

Lechner et al. also disclose wherein the projector moves the blank area of the display image so as to correspond to the changed display location of the first portion of the display image (Column 8, lines 6-22 explain that the images are generated at 60 Hz, which means that as the images move the screen is updated and the blank area as well as the inset position will be changed when the inset images move.).

Regarding claim 16, Nakagawa, Spletzer et al. and Lechner et al. disclose the display system of claim 1.

Spletzer et al. also disclose wherein a control mechanism changes the display location of the first portion of the display image by repositioning the window projector (Column 3, lines 13-17 explain that the video source, i.e. projector, can be moved to display on the appropriate portion of the display medium the image.).

Regarding claim 17, Nakagawa, Spletzer et al. and Lechner et al. disclose the display system of claim 1.

Spletzer et al. also disclose a system comprising a mirror for directing the output of the window projector to the display location, and wherein the control mechanism changes the display location of the first portion of the display image by repositioning the mirror (Column 3, lines 10-13 explain that a movable mirror can be used to steer the image where it needs to be on the display medium.).

Regarding claim 19, Nakagawa, Spletzer et al. and Lechner et al. disclose the display system of claim 1.

Spletzer et al. also disclose wherein the control mechanism comprises:

a pan/tilt control mechanism (Column 16, lines 19-26 explain about the pan/tilt unit.); and

a zoom control mechanism (Column 16, lines 27-34 explain about the zoom lens assembly.).

Regarding claim 27, please refer to the rejection of claim 1, and furthermore Spletzer et al. also disclose wherein a display device can be used as the first display medium (Column 2, lines 40-42).

Regarding claim 29, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claims 1 and 11.

Regarding claim 30, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

Regarding claim 33, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 4.

Regarding claim 34, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 5.

Regarding claim 35, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 6.

Regarding claim 36, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 7.

Regarding claim 37, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 8.

Regarding claim 38, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 9.

Regarding claim 39, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 12.

Regarding claim 40, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 13.

Regarding claim 42, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 15.

Regarding claim 43, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 16.

Regarding claim 44, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 17.

6. Claims 46 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakagawa (US 2004/0095314) in view of Spletzer et al. (US 6,919,909) and further in view of Lechner et al. (US 5,487,665) and Dugdale (US 5,707,128).

Regarding claim 46, please refer to the rejection of claim 1, and furthermore Nakagawa, Spletzer et al. and Lechner et al. fail to teach wherein the control mechanism changes the size of the window portion of the image in response to a user command for resizing the window.

Dugdale does teach a display system wherein a control mechanism changes the size of the window portion of the image in response to a user command for resizing the window (see col. 3, lines 4-9, where the lens on the target projector can perform a zoom function to change the size of the target image).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the zooming lens of Dugdale in the system taught by the combination of Nakagawa, Spletzer et al. and Lechner et al. in order to adjust the size of the target image if it does not appear to be the proper size.

Regarding claim 48, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 46.

7. Claims 22 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakagawa (US 2004/0095314) in view of Spletzer et al. (US 6,919,909) and further in view of Lechner et al. (US 5,487,665) and Fisher et al. (US 5,326,266).

Regarding claim 22, please refer to the rejection of claim 1, and furthermore Nakagawa, Spletzer et al. and Lechner et al. fail to teach a display system, wherein the window projector displays the portion of the image corresponding to a window without any visible seams.

Fisher et al. disclose a display system, wherein the window projector (Fig. 1, projector 14) displays the portion of the image corresponding to a window (Fig. 1, inset 10) without any visible seams (see col. 1, lines 65 - col. 2, line 5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Fisher et al. in the system taught by the combination of Nakagawa, Spletzer et al. and Lechner et al. in order to have an oscillating border to the inset area so that the inset image would appear blended with the background image.

Regarding claim 25, please refer to the rejection of claim 1, and furthermore Lechner et al. also disclose the multi-projector display system having a plurality of window projectors (Column 7, lines 46-48.) for each displaying, at a display location, a portion of the display image (Figure 1, images 24, see col. 5, lines 38-39.) and having a plurality of workspace projectors (Column 7, line 18-40).

Nakagawa, Spletzer et al. and Lechner et al. fail to teach a display system, wherein the window projector displays the portion of the image corresponding to a window without any visible seams.

Fisher et al. disclose a display system, wherein the window projector (Fig. 1, projector 14) displays the portion of the image corresponding to a window (Fig. 1, inset 10) without any visible seams (see col. 1, lines 65 - col. 2, line.5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Fisher et al. in the system taught by the combination of Nakagawa, Spletzer et al. and Lechner et al. in order to have an oscillating border to the inset area so that the inset image would appear blended with the background image.

8. Claim 47 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakagawa (US 2004/0095314) in view of Spletzer et al. (US 6,919,909) and further in view of Lechner et al. (US 5,487,665), Dugdale (US 5,707,128) and Fisher et al. (US 5,326,266).

Regarding claim 47, please refer to the rejection of claim 46.

Nakagawa, Spletzer et al., Lechner et al. and Dugdale fail to teach a display system, wherein the window projector displays the portion of the image corresponding to a window without any visible seams.

Fisher et al. disclose a display system, wherein the window projector (Fig. 1, projector 14) displays the portion of the image corresponding to a window (Fig. 1, inset 10) without any visible seams (see col. 1, lines 65 - col. 2, line 5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Fisher et al. in the system taught by the combination of Nakagawa, Spletzer et al., Lechner et al. and Dugdale in order to have an oscillating border to the inset area so that the inset image would appear blended with the background image.

9. Claim 49 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakagawa (US 2004/0095314) in view of Spletzer et al. (US 6,919,909) and further in view of Lechner et al. (US 5,487,665), Fisher et al. (US 5,326,266) and Surati et al. (US 6,456,339).

Regarding claim 49, Nakagawa, Spletzer et al. and Lechner et al. disclose the display system of claim 22.

Nakagawa, Spletzer et al. and Lechner et al. fail to disclose wherein the plurality of workspace projectors collectively display the second portion of the image by overlapping portions provided by each of the plurality of workspace projectors.

Surati et al. discloses of having projectors in which their display images overlap (Figure 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art at the time the invention was made to use the overlapping technique taught by Surati et al. with the display system taught by the combination of Nakagawa, Spletzer et al. and Lechner et al. in order to prevent the visualization of the black area created between each projector's projected image in a conventional image projection system.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Chaum (US 5,959,717) discloses a system containing two projectors in which one projector displays a background image with a blank area, and the second projector displays a portion of the image into the blank area.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen G. Sherman whose telephone number is (571) 272-2941. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amr Awad can be reached on (571) 272-7764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SS

17 December 2007

AMR A. AWAD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER